

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

At the time the Office Action was mailed, claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 11-22 were pending in the application. In the present response, no claims have been amended, added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 11-22 remain pending in the application

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

1. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0069080) (hereinafter "Roy") in view of Almog et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0002479) (hereinafter "Almog") and further in view of Balabine et al. (US 5,937,406) (hereinafter "Balabine"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for managing recruiting information in an online computer-based management system, the method comprising acts of:

 permitting, within a first instance of an interface of the computer-based management system, a first user to develop a first job description corresponding to a first job opening, the first job description comprising a first set of components, the first set of components comprising at least one first client information logic component for accessing an online database for first client-related information;

 storing, by the computer-based management system, the first set of components in the online database as at least one object-oriented object, wherein the online database is configured as an object hierarchy including a plurality of interrelated objects; and

 permitting, within another instance of the interface of the computer-based management system, a second user to create a second job description based upon the first job description, the second job description corresponding to a second job opening and having a second set of components, at least one of which is selected from the first set of components stored in the online database, the second set of components comprising at least one second client information logic component for accessing the online database for second client-related information.

(emphasis added).

Claim 1 is directed to the development of job descriptions corresponding to job openings, and includes the limitation “permitting, within a first instance of an interface of the computer-based management system, a first user to develop a first job description corresponding to a first job opening” (emphasis added). In contrast, Roy is directed “to a system for creating a searchable knowledge base of individuals’ skills indexed in a hierarchical cataloging, measuring and valuation system.” (Roy, ¶ [0011]). In other words, Roy is directed to creating resumes for individuals using a standardized system for identifying their skills.

This simple, but essential difference distinguishes claim 1 from the disclosure of Roy – a resume is not a job description, and a job description is not a resume.

Almog teaches a system for storing pre-existing worker profiles (resumes) and pre-existing job descriptions (Almog, Abstract). Almog does not teach the development of job descriptions.

Balabine teaches a file system interface to a database, which has nothing to do with developing job descriptions.

Therefore, Roy, Almog and Balabine, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject limitation of claim 1, and applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Independent claims 17 and 18 include the same or similar limitation as claim 1. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 17 and 18 are also patentable over the cited references.

Given that claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and include all of the limitations of claim 1, applicant submits that claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are also patentable over the cited references.

2. Claims 12-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy in view of Danielson et al. (US 6,993,723) and further in view of Balabine. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Independent claim 12 recites:

A method of interactively developing a job description in an online computer-based management system, the method comprising acts of:

receiving through a first instance of an interface of the computer-based management system, by a requirements specialist from a client, hiring needs; accessing, from an online database, client-related information; determining, by the requirements specialist based on the received hiring needs and the client-related information, at least one portion of a job description; storing the at least one portion of a job description in the online database as at least one object-oriented object, wherein the online database is configured as an object hierarchy including a plurality of interrelated objects; and receiving, in real-time, through another instance of the interface of the computer-based management system, feedback from the client on the portion of the job description; and modifying in the online database, by the requirements specialist, at least a portion of the portion of the job description based upon the received feedback.

Independent claim 12 is directed to a method for interactively developing a job description and includes the limitation, "determining, . . . at least one portion of a job description." As noted above, Roy and Balabine do not teach or suggest methods for developing job descriptions. Danielson is directed to a collaborative graphical interface (Danielson, Abstract) that does not teach or suggest the development of a job description. Accordingly, Roy, Balabine and Danielson, either alone or in combination, do not teach the subject limitation of claim 12, and claim 12 is patentable over the cited references.

Given that claims 13-16, 21 and 22 depend from claim 12, and include all of the limitations of claim 12, applicant submits that claims 13-16, 21 and 22 are also patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 19 and 20 are also directed to the interactive development of a job description and include the same or a similar limitation as claim 12. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 19 and 20 are also patentable over the cited references.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Aug 18, 2010

By Steven A. Moore

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 48329
Telephone: (617) 342-4034
Facsimile: (617) 342-4001

Steven A. Moore
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 55,462